

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,710	12/15/2005	George Marmaropoulos	US030211US	8531
24737 7590 09/14/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			FIGUEROA, FELIX O	
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2833	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summany	10/560,710	MARMAROPOULOS ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Felix O. Figueroa	2833				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 Ju	lly 2007.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	,—					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>3,5-7 and 13-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 8-12</u> is/are rejected.	6) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4 and 8-12</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		٠.				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Di					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application				

Art Unit: 2833

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Carr et al. (US 6,817,867).

Carr discloses an interconnect comprising: one or more socket connectors (38) of a flexible textile construction (12); and one or more jack connectors (80), wherein the one or more jack connectors are operatively connectable with the one or more socket connectors.

Regarding claim 2, Carr discloses the one or more socket connectors having one or more conductive contact areas.

Regarding claim 8, Carr discloses the interconnect used in a garment or upholstery.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Torok (US 5,108,301).

Torok discloses an interconnect, comprising: a socket (F); and a jack (10) with a concertina-like engaging portion (28, 26) and a body portion (12).

Regarding claim 11, Torok discloses the socket having one or more conductive contact areas.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Wu (US 6,155,882).

Carr discloses substantially the claimed invention except for collapsible socket. Wu teaches the use of a collapsible socket (2) to reduce the space occupied by the socket when it is not in use. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a collapsible socket, as taught by Wu, to reduce the space occupied by the socket when it is not in use.

Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Torok.

Carr discloses substantially the claimed invention except for specific jack. Torok teaches the jack (10) with a concertina-like engaging portion (28, 26) and a body portion (12) to securely lock the jack to the socket. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the jack of

Art Unit: 2833

Torok in different environments, such as the textile construction of Carr, to provide a secure connection.

Claim 12 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torok in view of Wu.

Torok discloses substantially the claimed invention except for collapsible socket. Wu teaches the use of a collapsible socket (2) to reduce the space occupied by the socket when it is not in use. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a collapsible socket, as taught by Wu, to reduce the space occupied by the socket when it is not in use.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer does not comply with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and/or (c) because: The terminal disclaimer has not been properly signed. The electronic signature lacks the attorney registration number.

Accordingly, the Double Patenting rejection remains.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2833

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 2 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/560,711. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 2 and 8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/568,437. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Please note that the fact that the present application does not disclose a circuit integrated in the garment does not obviate the issue of double patenting.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 07/02/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2833

In response to Applicant's argument that Carr fails to disclose "the socket connector that themselves are formed of a flexible textile construction", please note that since the textile is part of the construction of the socket, the socket is deemed to have/be of a textile construction. At least the outer part of the socket is of a textile construction.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the number of joints and segments) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2833

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Felix O. Figueroa whose telephone number is (571) 272-2003. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 10:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 Ext. 33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Felix O. Figueroa/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2833